

REMARKS

Claims have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's action.

After a personal interview with the Examiner on March 21, 2006, claims 15-19 have been cancelled in an agreement with the Examiner, due to improper wording, using "the improvement therein", which makes the prior text assumed to be known, and also they are Jepson type claims. Additionally, in view of Brownrigg (US Patent # 3,607,411, col. 5, lines 7-12).

Claims 9 and 20 have been also cancelled in view of Anderson (US Patent # 6,280,879) and Werner (US Patent # 3,694,392).

However, claims 14 and 23 have a unique feature of pulling and drying the web horizontally over a roller, which is not described in prior art, and therefore they should be allowed. (See Specification, Page 13, lines 16-25).

Independent claims 28-31 are rejected by the Examiner , as being unpatentable over Kejha (US Patent # 5,443,602) and Brownrigg (US Patent # 3,607,411).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner, that it would be obvious to combine these two patents to ensure an even coating of electrode materials on the web.


Applicants believe, that the Examiner misunderstood the principle of claims 28-31.

As it was explained during the interview, and in the prior Amendment of August 29, 2005 (Page 11, lines 5-16), the major difference from the prior art is in controlling the speed of the web before dip-coating, by using driven (metering) nip-rollers.

(Sequential second step, line 4 of each claim 28-31).

Accordingly, it is believed that the Amendment places the Application in condition for allowance and such action is requested and urged.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph B. Kejha
(applicant)